4.3 OTHER RESOURCES

This section addresses all environmental resource topics not evaluated in **Section 4.1, Biological Resources** and **Section 4.2, Cultural Resources.**

The project involves construction of an underground water line located in the right-of-way (ROW) of Rockville Road and as such it is anticipated that its effect on many resources will be negligible or less than significant. A discussion of project impacts is provided below, based on the checklist questions included in Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

AESTHETICS

Would the project:

- **Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

The Solano County General Plan Draft EIR (2008) identifies views of the Coast Range and nearby hills as a countywide scenic vista. During construction of the project, there may be temporary alterations to views of the Coast Range and nearby hills from the roadway and residences adjacent to the roadway by construction equipment or construction signage located on the shoulder of the roadway. However, construction activities would be temporary and would not result in any permanent effect on scenic vistas. The project is considered to have no impact and no mitigation is required.

- **Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

There are no officially designated state scenic highways located within Solano County.[1] Therefore, no impact to scenic resources would occur.

- **Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project area and its surroundings?**

The area surrounding Rockville Road is characterized as rural open space and grasslands with intermittent residential development. During construction, some pruning and limited tree removal would be required to accommodate equipment access and trenching in the shoulder of the roadway. Any necessary pruning or removal of trees in the roadway shoulder would slightly alter the visual character of the project area. However, the changes would be minimal and would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the rural open space or grasslands of the surrounding area. The project is considered to have no impact and no mitigation is required.

[1] Solano County General Plan Draft EIR, April 18, 2008, page 4.11-4.

- **Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

Temporary changes in lighting could occur during the construction period, which is estimated to last between three to six months. Lighting for safety purposes may be erected on the shoulder of Rockville Road where construction equipment is stored overnight. Once construction is complete, the operation of the project would not result in any new sources of light or glare. The potential temporary impacts related to lighting for public safety purposes would be less than significant.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the project:

- **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

According to the Solano County General Plan, designated Prime Farmland is located near the project area generally southwest and southeast of the intersection of Rockville Road and Green Valley Road.[2] Other areas surrounding the project are designated as either Grazing Land or Urban and Built-Up Land. However, all construction activities associated with the project would occur within the roadway ROW and would not affect any adjacent farmland. Therefore, no impact to farmland would occur.

- **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

According to the Solano County General Plan, the project area and its surroundings are not under a Williamson Act contract.[3] Therefore, no impact would occur.

- **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

No forest land exists in within the project area or in proximity to the project. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or cause the rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

- **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

[2] *Figure AG-1, Important Farmland*, Solano County General Plan, December 2008.
[3] *Figure AG-2, Williamson Act Contracts*, Solano County General Plan, December 2008.

No forest land exists in the vicinity of the project site. The project would not result in a loss of forest land, nor would it convert forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

- **Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use?**

As described above, there are no agricultural resources on the project site. The project would be located within the ROW of Rockville Road and would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, no impact would occur.

AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

- **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

The project site is located within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The project involves the construction of a water line within the ROW of Rockville Road. The operation of the project would not result in population growth or vehicle trips that could result in emissions. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or prevent attainment of the local air quality management plan. No impact would occur.

- **Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

Construction. Construction of the project would result in temporary emissions from trenching activities. Trenches within the Rockville Road corridor would be excavated to approximately 5 to 7 feet below the ground surface. Once each segment of the water line is installed, the trench would be backfilled with the same soil material excavated from that location. Due to the fact that some of the areas where the water line would be installed are paved, the dust emissions or emissions from operation of construction equipment would be minimal. The project shall implement the following dust control measures recommended by BAAQMD[4] during construction activities:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials *or* require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

[4] BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, December 1999. Table 2, page 15.

- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

Project construction would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation impact. Implementation of the dust control measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant impact.

Operation. The project would not result in operational emissions. The operation of the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. No impact would occur.

- **Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under any applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

The BAAQMD is in non-attainment for the federal and state standards for ozone and PM_{10}. However, the project involves the installation of a new water line under Rockville Road and would not emit daily direct or indirect emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxide (NOx), and PM_{10} that would exceed BAAQMD thresholds. Furthermore, mitigation measures would be implemented pursuant to the BAAQMD requirement to reduce PM_{10} emissions during construction to a less-than-significant level.

As noted above, the operation of the proposed water line would not result in any emissions. The project is replacing an existing water line, and operation of the water line would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality. No impact would occur.

- **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

Sensitive receptors in the project area include residences along Rockville Road. During construction, sensitive receptors could be exposed to a variety of airborne emissions including those from construction equipment. However, due to the limited scale and the short duration of construction, the proposed water line would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial permanent pollutant concentrations. Further, implementation of **Mitigation Measure AQ-1** would reduce dust pollutants and other airborne emissions that may result during construction within the project area. Therefore, this impact is less-than-significant.

- **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantive number of people?**

Objectionable odors are typically associated with landfills, sewer treatment plants, waste, and other industrial type land uses. The project would involve the installation of a water line and would not create objectionable odors. No impact would occur.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- **Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:**
  - **rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?**
  - **strong seismic ground shaking?**
  - **seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**
  - **landslides?**

The project site is located in a seismically active area of Solano County. According to the Solano County General Plan, the project site is located within a zone designated as the "Highest Potential Earthquake Damage Area."[5] The Cordelia fault (considered inactive) crosses the project in the north-south direction at a point east of Rockville Hills Park and west of the Rockville Road and Suisun Valley Road intersection. The Green Valley Fault is located 1.5 miles to the north and 1.5 miles to the south of the project area. The southern portion of the Green Valley Fault is included as a Special Studies Zone under the Alquist---Priolo Geologic Hazards Zones Act.[6] Although the project is located near an active earthquake fault, it does not include the construction of any structures above ground level for human occupancy and the installation of the water line would be constructed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code (UBC), which includes seismic design requirements. Furthermore, a geotechnical report is currently being prepared for the project, and is anticipated to be completed in March, 2010. The recommendations of this report will be incorporated into the project design to minimize potential impacts and/or risks associated with any identified geological conditions of the project area. Therefore, the proposed water line would not result in any risk of injury, loss or death resulting from fault rupture or strong seismic ground shaking and the impact would be less than significant.

[5] *Figure HS-3, Seismic Shaking Potential*, Solano County General Plan, December 2008.

[6] Solano County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, August 2008, page 4.7-11.

The project site is located in an area very low liquefaction potential.[7] A few areas along Rockville Road are mapped as low or moderate potential for liquefaction. However, the project does not include any structures above ground level for human occupancy and would be constructed according to UBC requirements and the recommendations of the geotechnical report that address seismic design. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction and the impact would be less than significant.

The eastern portion of the project area near the intersection of Rockville Road and Suisun Valley Road is mapped for landslide susceptibility.[8] The land surrounding the eastern portion of the Rockville Road corridor ranges from the least susceptible to the most susceptible for landslides. The remainder of the project site is not located in an area susceptible to landslides. The project does not include any structures aboveground that would be subject to potential landslides. Therefore, no impact related to landslides would occur.

- **Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

The project is located within areas of very severe, moderate, and slight erosion hazard ratings.[9] Slight erosion hazards are areas where erosion is likely under ordinary climatic conditions. Moderate erosion hazards are areas where erosion is likely and some erosion control measures may be needed. A severe erosion hazard rating is designated where significant erosion is expected and soil control measures are costly and often impractical.

The General Plan identifies a severe erosion hazard near Rockville Hills Regional Park; however, the installation of an underground water line where Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction would not result in a sever erosion hazard. Soil that is excavated would be used as backfill, and the soil within the road corridor would be returned to existing conditions. Operation of the water line would not result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil and the impact is therefore considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

- **Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

---

[7] Solano County General Plan, December 2008, page HS-29.

[8] *Figure HS-5, Landslide Stability*, Solano County General Plan, December 2008.

[9] *Exhibit 4.7-6, Erosion Hazards of Disturbed Soil*, Solano County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, August 2008.

The project would not result in any permanent structures. Furthermore, the project does not include any structures that would be located on a geologic unit that is unstable. No impact would occur.

- **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life and property?**

According to the Solano County General Plan, the project area east of Green Valley Road is located in a zone with moderate shrink-swell potential. The remainder of the project site is not located on expansive soils.[10] The project does not include any buildings or structures, and therefore would not create risks to life or property. The installation of the water line is designed to accommodate the local soil characteristics. No impact would occur.

- **Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

The criterion is not applicable. The project does not require the installation of a septic tank or sewer system. No impact would occur.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

The project involves the construction of water line within the Rockville Road corridor. The project would not result in population growth or vehicle trips that could result in greenhouse gas emissions. No impact would occur.

- **Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

The project involves the construction of water line within the Rockville Road corridor. The project would not result in population growth or vehicle trips that could result in emissions. Operation of the project would not generate any emissions; therefore the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Solano County has not adopted any plans, policies or regulations for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. Applicable state legislation related to reducing the emissions of GHG is summarized below:

State of California Executive Order S-3-05

[10] *Figure HS-7, Shrink-Swell Potential*, Solano County General Plan, December 2008.

In June 2005, the Governor of California signed Executive Order S-3-05, which identified the California Environmental Protection Act (CalEPA) as the lead coordinating State agency for establishing climate change emission reduction targets in California. The "Climate Action Team", a group of state agencies, was set up to implement Executive Order S-3-05. Under this order, the State plans to reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. GHG emission reduction strategies and measures to reduce global warming were identified in the 2006 Climate Action Team Report.

Assembly Bill 32 - The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006

In 2006, the governor of California signed AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act, into law. The Act requires California to cap its greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels by 2020. This legislation requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to establish a program for statewide GHG emissions reporting, and monitoring/enforcement of that program. CARB recently published a list of discrete GHG emission reduction measures that can be implemented immediately. CARB was also required to adopt rules and regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emission reductions. CARB's Early Action Plan identified regulations and measures that could be implemented in the near future to reduce GHG emissions.

Many of the measures to reduce GHG emissions from transportation will come from CARB. AB 1493, the Pavley Bill, directed CARB to adopt regulations to reduce emissions from new passenger vehicles. CARB's AB32 Early Action Plan released in 2007 included a strengthening of the Pavley regulation for 2017 and included a commitment to develop a low carbon fuel standard (LCFS). Current projections indicate that with implementation of a strengthened Pavley Regulation, including LCFS, California will still fall short of the 1990 level targets for transportation emission reductions. Under the Bush Administration, the U.S. EPA blocked California's efforts to implement an LCFS, however, the Obama Administration has directed the U.S. EPA to reconsider its action. Nonetheless, the earlier U.S. EPA action and pending legal challenges by the automotive industry could continue to delay California's efforts to achieve emission reduction targets.

CARB is targeting other sources of emissions. The main measures to reduce GHG emissions will be contained in the AB32 Scoping Plan. A draft of that plan was released in June 2008 and was approved by CARB in December 2008. This plan includes a range of GHG reduction actions. Central to the draft plan is a cap and trade program covering 85 percent of the state's emissions. This program will be developed in conjunction with the Western Climate Initiative, comprised of seven states and three Canadian provinces, to create a regional carbon market. The plan also proposes that utilities produce a third of their energy from renewable sources such as wind, solar and geothermal, and proposes to expand and strengthen existing energy efficiency programs, such as building and appliance standards. The plan also includes full implementation of the Pavley standards to provide a wide range of less polluting and more efficient cars and trucks to consumers who will save on operating costs through reduced fuel use. The plan also calls for development and implementation of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, which would require

oil companies to make cleaner, domestically produced fuels. The regulatory process begins in 2009 to implement the plan. The details in regulating emissions and developing targeted fees to administer the program would be developed through this process. This would last two years and measures must be enacted by 2012.

Senate Bill 375 - California's Regional Transportation and Land Use Planning Efforts

California enacted legislation (SB 375) to expand the efforts of AB 32 by controlling indirect GHG emissions. SB 375 would develop emission-reduction goals around which regions could apply to planning activities. SB 375 provides incentives, such as transportation funding, for local governments and developers to implement new conscientiously planned growth patterns. This includes incentives for creating attractive, walkable and sustainable communities and revitalizing existing communities. The legislation also allows developers to bypass certain environmental reviews under CEQA if they build projects consistent with the new sustainable community strategies. Development of more alternative transportation options that would reduce vehicle trips and miles traveled, along with traffic congestion, would be encouraged. SB 375 enhances CARB's ability to reach the AB 32 goals by directing the agency to develop regional GHG emission reduction targets to be achieved from the transportation sector for 2020 and 2035. CARB would work with the metropolitan planning organizations (e.g., ABAG and MTC) to align their regional transportation, housing and land use plans to reduce vehicle miles travelled and demonstrate the region's ability to attain its GHG reduction targets.

The project would not directly generate greenhouse gas emissions since the project is a water line and does not involve any new construction or development. Current land uses and traffic patterns in the project area would not change as a result of the proposed water line and there would be no generation of greenhouse gases relative to existing conditions. Therefore the project would not conflict with AB 32, SB 375, and Executive Order S-3-05 and no impact would occur.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

- **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or**

- **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

The project would not involve the routine transport, use, or storage of hazardous materials. Construction activities would include the temporary and short-term transport and handling of various construction materials that are classified as hazardous materials

(e.g., diesel fuel, oil, and gasoline). Due to the nature of the project, these materials would not be used on the site in large quantities. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

Solano Community College is located 0.35 miles south of the project site. As discussed above, operation of the project would not emit hazardous materials or handle hazardous materials. Some hazardous materials would be present on site during construction. However, construction is a temporary condition at the site. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to the Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

The Envirostar Database operated by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control contains information regarding federal superfund sites, state response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, and school cleanup sites. Included in the State Response sites are hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. There are no known hazardous materials sites within the project site or on the land adjacent to Rockville Road corridor.[11] Therefore, the project would not be located on a hazardous materials site, and project construction and operation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impact would occur.

- **For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

The project is approximately 12 miles west of the Travis Air Force Base, and lies outside the boundaries of the airport land use plan. Therefore, implementation of the project would not expose people working on the project site to hazards from aircraft overflights. No impact would occur.

- **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in any safety hazards related to private airstrips. No impact would occur.

[11] http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/SectionA.htm. Accessed January 22, 2010.

- **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

The Cordelia Fire Protection District (CFPD) serves the communities of Green Valley, Rockville, Cordelia, and Lower Suisun Valley in Solano County. A CFPD station is located at 1600 Rockville Road, directly west of the western terminus of the project. Another station in the project vicinity is located at 2155 Cordelia Road.

During the construction period, flaggers would be present at all times to control the flow of traffic around the open trench. If an emergency vehicle is dispatched from the CFPD station on Rockville Road, the flaggers would stop all traffic in both directions on the roadway and would allow the fire engines to pass. No lane closures would be required on Rockville Road during non-construction hours. The operation of the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and the impact would be less than significant.[12]

- **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

Although the project site is located in an area of moderate to very high wildland fire hazards,[13] the project does not include residences or structures. Since the project involves installation of a water line, it would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No impact would occur.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Would the project:

- **Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permits are required by Solano County for construction projects disturbing more than 1 acre of soil. However, because the construction of the proposed water line would not result in soil disturbance of more than 1 acre, the project would not be subject to the provisions of the NPDES permit. The County does not have standard specifications for the establishment of stormwater pollution control for projects with less than 1-acre of disturbed soil; as such, supplemental conditions have been identified in the project's Encroachment Permit Application with the County.

In accordance with the supplemental provisions of the Encroachment Permit, the project contractor shall perform water pollution control work in conformance with the Standard

[12] Chief Joseph Huyssoon, Cordelia Fire Protection District, *Personal Communication*, February 10, 2010.

[13] *Figure HS-9, Wildland Fire Hazard Areas*. Solano County General Plan, December 2008.

Specifications of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Caltrans requires that a Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) addressing control measures be prepared and implemented by the construction contractor for projects resulting in soil disturbance of less than 1-acre. The WPCP must comply with Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 7-1.01G, Water Pollution, and must be prepared in accordance with the Special Provisions following the procedures and format set forth in the *Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Pollution Control Program (WPCP) Preparation Manual* and its addenda in effect on the day the Notice to Bidders is dated. Adherence to the requirements described above would ensure that the project would not substantially degrade water quality in Green Valley Creek or Suisun Valley Creek. Given the STA's intent to implement these standard requirements, the construction of the project would have a less-than-significant impact on water quality. Operation of the project would not result in any impact on water quality.

- **Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

The proposed water line would not use groundwater to supply water to users of the Vallejo Lakes water system. Therefore, the project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. No impact would occur.

- **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; or**
- **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

Drainage in the project area consists of a localized storm drain system. Stormwater runoff from the western portion of the project area is collected through inlets and swales in the roadway ROW before flowing into Green Valley Creek. Stormwater runoff from the eastern portion of the project area is collected through swales and man-made ditches before flowing into Suisun Valley Creek. Operation of the project would not permanently alter the drainage systems in the project area; however, construction activities would include removal of asphalt and concrete, trenching, and operation of heavy equipment, which could cause temporary disruptions to the drainage systems.

In accordance with the supplemental provisions of the Encroachment Permit, the project contractor shall perform water pollution control work in conformance with the Standard

Specifications described above. STA will prepare a WPCP that would contain BMPs to reduce soil erosion and flooding. Street sweeping would be implemented during construction, as needed. Based on the implementation of these standard measures, impacts to stormwater runoff are considered less than significant.

- **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

Operation of the project would not permanently change runoff conditions; however, construction activities would have the potential to change runoff conditions temporarily and add sources of pollutants to the runoff. Preparation of the WPCP that would include BMPs to reduce runoff during construction activities would reduce impacts to stormwater drainage systems to a less-than-significant level. Operation of the project would not involve any activities or sources that could add pollutants to site runoff. Therefore, impacts related to runoff conditions would be less than significant.

- **Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

Impact HYDRO-1: Excavation of the trench to a depth between 5 and 7 feet deep would impact groundwater quality. (Significant)

The project includes excavation of the trench to a depth of 5 to 7 feet. Based on boring data, groundwater was encountered at three of 15 boring locations at depths of 4.5 feet, 8 feet, and 11 feet. Given this, there is a potential to encounter groundwater during trenching activities. **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1** would protect water quality during construction activities and would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1: Implement Pollution Control Standards

If groundwater is encountered during trenching, the following Caltrans water pollution control standards would be implemented:

- At least 10 days before starting dewatering, submit a Dewatering and Discharge Plan to the County under Section 5-1.02, "Plans and Working Drawings," and "Water Pollution Control" of the Standard Specifications. Dewatering and Discharge Plan must include:
  - Title sheet and table of contents;
  - Description of dewatering and discharge activities detailing locations, quantity of water, equipment, and discharge point;
  - Estimated schedule for dewatering and discharge (start and end dates, intermittent or continuous);
  - Discharge alternatives such as dust control or percolation;
  - Visual monitoring procedures with inspection log;

- Conduct dewatering activities under the Field Guide for Construction Dewatering;

- Ensure that dewatering discharge does not cause erosion, scour, or sedimentary deposits that impact natural bedding materials;

- Discharge water within project limits. If water cannot be discharged within project limits due to site constraints, dispose of it in the same way specified for material in Section 7-1.13, "Disposal of Material Outside the Highway Right of Way";

- Do not discharge storm water or non-storm water that has an odor, discoloration other than sediment, an oily sheen, or foam on the surface. Notify the Engineer immediately upon discovering any of those conditions;

- Water Pollution Control (WPC) manager must inspect dewatering activities;
  - Daily when dewatering work occurs daily;
  - Weekly when dewatering work does not occur daily.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1** would protect groundwater, if encountered, during construction and would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than Significant.

- **Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

The project does not include housing. The project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. No impact would occur.

- **Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

The project does not propose any structures that could impede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur.

- **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

The project does not include any housing or aboveground structures. Therefore, the project would not expose people or aboveground structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. No impact would occur.

- **Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

The project does not include any housing or structures that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

- **Physically divide an established community?**

The project would occur within an existing roadway ROW and would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.

- **Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation, of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

The project area is located within unincorporated Solano County and subject to the Solano County General Plan and other related Solano County planning documents. The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation. No impact would occur.

- **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

Portions of the project area are located within the Solano County administrative draft Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). As discussed in more detail in **Section 4.1** of this EIR, the project would not be in conflict with the Solano County administrative draft HCP. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mineral Resources

Would the project:

- **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or**

- **Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

According to the Solano County General Plan, the project area is located in a Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3).[14] Areas designated as MRZ-3 contain mineral deposits that may or may not be significant but cannot be evaluated from available data.

The project would be located within an existing roadway ROW that is already developed for the purpose of transportation. The project would not result in any substantial loss of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region or state and would not result in additional loss of important mineral resource recovery. No impact would occur.

NOISE

Would the project:

- **Expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

- **Expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

- **Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

Construction activities associated with the project would include the removal of asphalt, trenching, and asphalt replacement. These activities could result in a temporary increase in noise levels. Surrounding noise-sensitive receptors in the project area include residents of single family homes along Rockville Road and trail users of Rockville Hills Regional Park.

Construction noise levels would be temporary and intermittent. The effects of noise resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors. Although construction noise would be localized to each segment of the roadway, residences along Rockville Road would be intermittently exposed to elevated levels of noise during the

[14] *Figure RS-4, Mineral Resources*. Solano County General Plan, December 2008.

construction period. Implementation of the following measures in accordance with the Solano County General Plan would minimize noise levels from construction activities, reducing this impact to a less-than-significant level. [15]

- Construction Scheduling. The construction contractor shall limit construction activity to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays and 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Saturdays. No construction shall be allowed on Sundays and holidays or without authorization from the County of Solano.
- Construction Equipment Mufflers and Maintenance. Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Construction Traffic. Route all construction traffic to and from the construction area via designated truck routes where possible. Prohibit construction-related heavy truck traffic in residential areas where feasible.

- **Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

As discussed above, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. No impact would occur.

- **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

The project area is approximately 12 miles west of the Travis Air Force Base and is not located within the airport land use plan. Therefore, the project would not expose workers to excessive noise levels of a public airport and no impact would occur.

- **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, implementation of the project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels related to private airstrips.

[15] Solano County General Plan Draft EIR, April 18, 2008, page 4.3-33

Population and Housing

Would the project:

- **Induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

The project would not add new homes, businesses, roads, or other growth in the project area. The new water line would connect the existing 24-inch Gordon water line running within Suisun Valley Road with the existing 14-inch Green water line. The proposed water line would not change the capacity of the system or provide an opportunity for new connections, as the Vallejo Lakes water system is operating at or near capacity and a permanent moratorium has been imposed to prohibit water connections to properties not currently eligible to be served by this system. The project would serve as a replacement water line and would not provide for any growth in the project area. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly. This impact is considered less-than-significant.

- **Displace substantial numbers of existing houses, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or**
- **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

The project would not displace any existing housing or people and there would be no need for replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

Public Services and Recreation

Would the project:

- **Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**
  - **Fire protection?**
  - **Police protection?**
  - **Schools?**
  - **Parks?**
  - **Other public facilities; or**

- **Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or**
- **Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

The relocation of an existing water line would not result in an increase in the population of Solano County. There would be no increase in demand for public services, including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, recreational facilities, or other public facilities. As the project would not affect population, it would not result in any increased use of existing parks or other recreational facilities in the area, nor would it require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. No impact to public services or recreation would occur.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Would the project:

- **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?; or**
- **Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Installation of the water line would temporarily obstruct portions of Rockville Road, and a road crew would be present at all times during construction. As described in **Section 3.0**, a single-lane closure would be required during work hours within the active construction zone. These temporary single-lane closures would require flaggers to direct traffic through the open lane.

Construction activities would occur in the right-of-way, adjacent to the travel lanes. The project includes the installation of signs along the roadway to warn drivers of the closed lane and shoulder where construction activity is taking place. The installation of warning signs would reduce traffic speeds along Rockville Road during construction of the project for the safety of the construction workers on site and automobiles using the roadway. Although traffic along Rockville Road may be slowed during the construction period, this would be a temporary condition.

Except for a small increase in vehicles accessing the site during the construction period, there would be no increase in traffic as a result of the project. Therefore, the project would not affect the performance of the circulation system in the project area. No impact would occur.

- **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

Implementation of the project would have no impact on air traffic patterns. Therefore the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

- **Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

As described above, the project would require single-lane closures at the active work zone along Rockville Road; a road crew and flaggers would be present during construction activities to ensure driver safety. Operation of the water line would not increase roadway hazards. Impacts would be less than significant.

- **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

As described above, the project would require a single-lane closure at two points along Rockville Road, and a road crew and flaggers would be present during construction activities to ensure driver safety. Adequate emergency access would be maintained at all times during construction activities. Once construction is complete, the operation of the project would have no effect on emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

- **Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?**

The project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. No impact would occur.

Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

- **Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

As discussed above, the project would not result in a permanent change to existing drainage on the project site or result in permanent increased runoff. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. No impact would occur.

- **Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or**
- **Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

The project would not require the construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities or the construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities. No impact would occur.

- **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

The proposed water line would serve as a replacement line in the existing water supply system. The project would not generate any additional water demand. No impact would occur.

- **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

The project would not generate wastewater. No impact would occur.

- **Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or**
- **Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

The operation of the project would not generate any solid waste.

Construction trenching for the project would require the removal of roadway paving material and some concrete from adjoining driveways. Trenching would also require the excavation of sand bedding and other road base materials including some native soils. Construction would comply with Caltrans requirements for Construction Site Management, which includes management of waste. If practicable, Caltrans requires that non-hazardous job site waste and excess material be recycled.

The roadway paving materials and concrete are recyclable, and any excess dirt could be used as fill material for other projects in the area. If the contractor identifies another project in the area in need of soil or other material such as the recyclable roadway paving material and concrete, then no waste would be generated from the project site. If no other projects in the area are identified that can accept the materials, then the material would be

hauled to the nearest landfill. It is anticipated that the amount of waste generated by the construction of the project would be minimal, and impacts related to the solid waste would be less than significant.

Energy

A discussion of potential energy impacts of a project is required by Appendix F of the *State CEQA Guidelines* to be included in an EIR. During project construction, energy would be consumed by the construction vehicles accessing the project site. However, operation of the project would not result in any energy consumption. Construction would be temporary, and the amount of energy consumed during construction would be minimal. Furthermore, the project would not generate a need for new or altered energy infrastructure. Therefore, impacts related to energy would be less than significant.

Cumulative Analysis

The cumulative analysis of biological and cultural resources is provided in **Section 4.1** and **Section 4.2**, respectively. The potential cumulative effect of the project on all other resources is discussed below.

Cumulative development includes past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development that could affect the same resources as the project in such a way that a combined physical impact could occur. The Solano County General Plan EIR was completed in 2008, providing a comprehensive analysis of anticipated development within the County. The following cumulative analysis also takes into account certain transportation and development projects within the City of Fairfield. These other projects are identified in **Chapter 4.0** of this EIR.

The Solano County General Plan EIR states that build out of the County would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to many resources, including increases in population growth, traffic levels of service, traffic noise, emissions from mobile sources, demand for groundwater and surface water supplies, land use conflicts, loss of sensitive habitat, conversion of farmland, historic properties, conversion of local viewsheds, and climate change.

As discussed in this chapter, the project would have no impact on many of these resources, including agriculture and forestry resources, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, mineral resources, public services and recreation, and transportation. Because the project would not have any effect upon these resources, its contribution to any identified cumulative impact upon these resources *would not* be considerable.

Resource areas where the project would result in a less-than-significant impact include aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, population and housing, and utilities and service systems. As shown

in **Table 4.3-1**, the project's less-than-significant impacts relate to temporary construction-period conditions, and would not represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to any of the cumulative impacts identified in the Solano County General Plan EIR.

Table 4.3-1 Comparison of Cumulative Impacts

Resource Area	General Plan EIR Cumulative Impact	Project Impact	Cumulatively Considerable Project Impact
Conversion of Local Viewsheds	Yes	No Impact	No
Conversion of Important Farmland	Yes	No Impact	No
Emissions of ozone and particulate matter (both PM10 and PM2.5) Exposure to TAC emissions from mobile sources Carbon monoxide emissions from local mobile sources	Yes	Less than Significant	No
Loss of sensitive habitat	Yes	Less than Significant	No
Historical Built-Environment resources	Yes	No Impact	No
Population Growth	Yes	No Impact	No
Traffic Noise	Yes	Less than Significant	No
Public Services	Yes	No Impact	No
Degradation of roadways levels of service	Yes	No Impact	No
Demand for groundwater and surface water supplies	Yes	No Impact	No
Increase in demand for energy	Yes	No Impact	No

Source: CirclePoint, 2010

References

Correspondence with Chief Joseph Huyssoon, Cordelia Fire Protection District, February 10, 2010.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Cortese List. Available at: http://www.calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/SectionA.htm; last accessed: January 22, 2010.

Solano County (2008a). *Solano County General Plan*.

Solano County (2008b). *Solano County General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. Available at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/Plans/CEQA%20Guide/ceqa_guide.ashx; last accessed February 23, 2010; last accessed: February 23, 2010.